UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,593	10/29/2003	Brian Harold Kelley	030618	8306
	7590 12/10/200 INCORPORATED	EXAMINER		
5775 MOREHO	OUSE DR.		HASSAN, AURANGZEB	
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2182	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/10/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com kascanla@qualcomm.com nanm@qualcomm.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Comments	10/697,593	KELLEY, BRIAN HAROLD		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	AURANGZEB HASSAN	2182		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 S This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under the condition of the condition of the condition is in condition. 	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4)	rejected.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the E drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ction is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) \(\sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 2182

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/17/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, 29-33, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walters et al. (US Patent Number 6,914,695 hereinafter "Walters") in view of Curtiss et al. (US Publication Number 2003/0162497, hereinafter "Curtiss") further in view of Findikli (US Patent Number 7,305,254).
- 4. As per claims 29, 33, 35 and 36, Walters teaches a medium, system, method and device comprising:

a peripheral device (digital camera, element 11, figure 2);

Art Unit: 2182

a mobile wireless communication device comprising (IBM ThinkPad, element 10, figure 2);

a computer platform (element 10, figure 2 runs Windows OS, column 2, lines 27 – 32), said computer platform comprising:

a plurality of resident programs, each resident program respectively associated with a communication protocol (column 5, lines 18 – 21); and an operating system (Windows, column 2, lines 27 – 32) for managing resources of said mobile wireless communication devices and for controlling an interaction of the mobile wireless communication device said peripheral device; wherein

said peripheral device selectively communicates with said mobile wireless communication device using a specific communication protocol (Bluetooth, column 5, lines 18 – 21), and

upon said peripheral device communicating with said mobile wireless communication device, said operating system identifies (device ID, figure 8) a selected resident program associated with said specific communication protocol and links said selected resident program with said peripheral device (column 13, lines 6 – 9), and said operating system identifies said selected resident program by:

attempting to identify said peripheral device (figure 3) and an identified peripheral device to a corresponds to one of said resident programs (HTML interface, column 13, lines 13 – 52).

Although Walters has the Windows operating system that maps peripherals based upon communication protocols resident on the host device (see note below), Walters does not explicitly disclose *automatically* mapping the peripheral device.

Curtiss teaches a medium, system, method and device, wherein:

if a peripheral is identified, automatically mapping from said identified peripheral device to a corresponding mobile wireless communication device interface (paragraph [0057], or

if said peripheral is not identified, determining a communication protocol of said peripheral device wherein the determined communication protocol is used to automatically map to a corresponding mobile wireless communication device interface (paragraph [0058-0059].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Walters with the device identification of Curtiss. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to make such modification in order to reduce engineering and manufacturing costs associated with providing communication to a peripheral post manufacture (paragraph [0013]).

Walters and Curtiss does not explicitly disclose the interface being identified as the resident program.

Findikli teaches when a peripheral device is identified, automatically mapping from said identified peripheral device to a corresponding one of said resident programs (figure 2).

Art Unit: 2182

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the combination of Walters and Curtiss that of the resident software identification of Findikli. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to make such modification in order to enhance the flexibility of interaction between devices (column 1, lines 36 - 46).

The Examiner notes previously cited Rathbone as extrinsic evidence to the protocol utilized by the Windows Operating System in the installation of a peripheral. The operating system first attempts to identify the peripheral and install it based upon driver/communication protocol already resident in the host device. If the protocol is not found further attempts and prompts are made to attain communication (operating system Windows XP detects cameras when first plugged in, page 296 "Scanners and cameras")

5. As per claims 2, 11, 18, and 30, Walters teaches a system, method, device, and medium wherein, the peripheral device communicates with the mobile wireless communication device through a wired connection (cable connection, column 6, lines 32 – 43, USB Serial, column 2, lines 43 – 45).

The examiner cites two wired connectivity options taught by Walters.

Art Unit: 2182

6. As per claims 3, 12, and 19, Walters teaches a system, method, and device wherein, the peripheral device communicates with the mobile wireless communication device through a wireless connection (Bluetooth, column 6, lines 32 - 47, infrared, column 2, lines 41 - 43).

The examiner cites two wireless connectivity options taught by Walters.

- 7. As per claims 4, 13, 20, and 31, Walters teaches a system, method, device, and medium wherein said attempting to identify comprises the peripheral device sending a class identifier (registered camera ID, column 8, lines 16 19) to the operating system of the mobile wireless communication device and said successfully identified comprises the operating system determining the type of the peripheral device and selecting a resident program corresponding to a appropriate handler for that peripheral device based upon the class identifier (column 8, lines 11 51).
- 8. As per claims 5, 21, and 32, Walters teaches a system, device, and medium wherein said attempting to identify comprises the peripheral device sending a specific identifier (ID, column 8, lines 16 19) to the operating system of the mobile wireless communication device and said successfully identified comprises the operating system determining the type of the peripheral device and selecting a resident program (column 8, lines 11 51) corresponding to an appropriate handler for that peripheral device based upon the specific identifier (column 8, lines 64 67, column 9, lines 1 23).

Art Unit: 2182

9. As per claims 6, 15, and 22, Walters teaches a system, method and device wherein the peripheral uses the mobile wireless communication device as a communication portal to the Internet (column 11, lines 14 – 19).

- 10. As per claim 7, Walters teaches a system wherein, the peripheral device uses the mobile wireless communication device as a communication portal over a telephone network (element 205, figure 4, column 9, lines 3 6).
- 11. As per claim 8, Walters teaches a system wherein, the peripheral device communicates with the computer platform of the mobile wireless communication device through the communication portal of the computer platform (Bluetooth, column 5, lines 18-21).
- 12. As per claims 37 40, Curtis teaches a medium, system, method and device wherein the mobile wireless communication device is selected from the group consisting of mobile telephones, two-way pagers, and personal digital assistants (PDAs) (paragraph [0002]).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, 29-33 and 35-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2182

Applicant makes arguments pertaining to transfer of resident programs. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., transfer of a resident program) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore the Applicant has amended the claims to recite mobile wireless communication device in response to the Examiner's suggestion that the invention according to the specification is best understood to be a cellular telephone. The Applicant has added new claims to further embody the cellular telephone concept however the Examiner notes that a wireless notebook computer can be interpreted as a mobile wireless communications device.

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AURANGZEB HASSAN whose telephone number is (571)272-8625. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2182

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AΗ

/Tariq Hafiz/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2182